

University of Pannonia  
Faculty of Humanities  
Multilingualism Doctoral School

# Contemporary Gaelic language revival efforts in the English- speaking world



Written by: Nagy Levente  
Supervisor: Dr. Hortobágyi Ildikó

Veszprém  
2025

## Abstract

Nagy Levente

### **Contemporary Gaelic language revival efforts in the English-speaking world**

The challenges faced by minority languages in the contemporary linguistic landscape have been a relevant topic for several years. With global languages claiming an increasing share of speakers, smaller, community-based languages have been neglected in favour of the lingua franca (Skutnabb-Kangas 1997, 2017). The research aims to present several possible ways in which this linguistic exposure can be transformed into a potential boon for language education and maintenance in smaller languages, rather than being a hinderance, based on new methods utilizing commonly consumed media as a medium to achieve increased language usage and recognition (Skogerbø 2001, Sapir 2005,2006, Pietikäinen et al. 2010). Based on results, the research can provide potential applications of hitherto unrelated aspects (speaker attitudes, views on language) as a means to improve language retention and revitalization methods, mostly used in a workshop fashion.

Keywords: sociolinguistics, minority languages, language maintenance, language revival, Gaelic Language Plan

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. The history of Gaelic languages

In an effort to establish the presently unfolding situation and general details surrounding the state(s) of the Gaelic (Goidelic) languages - Irish (Irish Gaelic), Scottish Gaelic, and Manx - and their relationship to other Celtic languages, the first prudent step is to examine the heavily intertwined history of these languages, and by extension, their peoples and cultures. It is important to note that for the earlier parts of the paper, focus will be shifting between Irish and Scottish Gaelic, this serving as a historical foundation, as it is difficult to differentiate between the origins of these languages. Establishing the first point on this timeline, Emperor Claudius' invasion in AD 43–44 is an early instance of the Celtic languages of Britain - particularly the Brythonic varieties - coming under the authority and influence of a dominant imperial language and culture. This, however was not a wholly negative event for the language in question, as research concerning Roman Britain has suggested that instead of engulfing the already existing language groups and scenarios, there was a much larger degree of bilingualism than one might initially assume from the time period.

A key indicator in this regard is found in two different periods. During the time of the invasion, the native inhabitants spoke a Celtic language (Woodcock, 2016). Notably however, after the Roman Empire had started to diminish in power at the beginning of the 5th century AD, and subsequently the province of Britannia no longer existed, the Celtic language was still very much present, in sharp contrast to the general assumption that it would disappear after centuries of Latin. Other factors also suggest that Britain as a whole was not as “Roman” as other contemporary provinces in the empire. One of the most notable findings is related to the number, or rather, the lack of Roman inscriptions from this era, especially when compared to the unusually large military presence that the empire deployed for a region of its size. Further research has suggested that Celtic and Latin were by no means isolated from one another, not only implying that a large number of Britain's population were bilingual, but also the fact that Celtic was by no means a “weak” language – otherwise Latin would have been the dominant language in the region (Woodcock, 2016). It is worth noting that this phenomenon, namely bilingualism in the Roman province, proves that despite the attempts to subjugate them, the Gaelic languages had remained active and present in the Middle Ages.

To that end, the study formulates the following specific research objectives:

- To assess how Irish has historically been positioned within the Irish society and language policy;
- To identify key phases of stagnation, decline, or symbolic containment (e.g., its role as a "trophy language");
- To compile and analyze contemporary data that reflect recent gains in speaker numbers, language education, and cultural engagement;
- To evaluate whether these developments are indicative of a durable, community-rooted language revitalization effort;
- To examine whether public attitudes and identity-related associations with Irish have measurably improved in recent decades.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. Language revival methods**

When examining approaches taken to revive Gaelic, a dominant example is that of Irish in Belfast – a language that was spoken natively in parts of Northern Ireland up until the 1950s, but then slowly it disappeared from this area in the following years. By 1965 there were approximately 36 families still using the language for everyday conversations in Belfast, with the addition of 5 reported young couples choosing to adapt their families to Irish, including raising their children with Irish as their L1. None of them were native speakers, and almost all of them learned the language as a passion project in adulthood. Their collective efforts resulted in an Irish-medium primary school being established in 1971 (Maguire, 1991). Over the years the school developed steadily and eventually attracted children from other parts of the city, whose parents were language learners of Irish. As the popularity of the Irish medium education grew, an additional Irish-medium primary school was established in 1987, with two more secondary schools and a number of nurseries having been set up in the following years; this surge was accompanied by a large number of Irish language evening classes for adults, which were run by volunteers all throughout Northern Ireland in an effort to keep up with the demands (Mac Póilin, 1997). A vibrant programme of cultural and social events regarding Irish has also

developed in later years, and an Irish language daily newspaper was printed from 1984 to 2008, with a modernized online version still being published to this day. There have been short daily Irish language broadcasts on BBC Radio Ulster since 1986 (Maguire, 1991) and an Irish language community radio station, Raidió Fáilte, was launched in 2002. Subsequently, a new Irish-speaking community has been re-established in areas of Belfast and Northern Ireland. Maguire (1991) and Hindley (1990) argue that the revival of Irish in Northern Ireland has not been as successful as some enthusiasts claim, nor that it has much relevance or provides much hope for Irish as a whole – this viewpoint supports the notion proposed by Carnie (1995), who regards Irish as a sort of consolation prize – despite official recognition, and status, the actual usage of the language falls very short of expected numbers. In the Republic of Ireland, Irish is an official language, has been a compulsory subject in Ireland's schools since 1922 and its mastery is required for a number of positions in civil service. Despite these points however, only a minority of those who study Irish in schools become fluent, and many have negative impressions of the language (Hindley, 1990).

## **2.2. Joshua Fishman's (1991) GIDS**

Joshua Fishman's *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages* (1991) remains a cornerstone of contemporary sociolinguistic theory, particularly in the domain of language planning and revitalization. His introduction of the GIDS provides a diagnostic tool to assess the severity of language endangerment and offers a structured model for guiding efforts to reverse language decline. The GIDS is predicated on the understanding that intergenerational transmission - the act of parents teaching their children to speak a minority language in naturalistic, everyday contexts - is the essential cornerstone of language survival. Institutional support, while beneficial, is viewed as secondary to the informal, community-based domains in which language use is most robust and enduring (Fishman, 1991).

The GIDS system introduced by Fishman (1991) has cemented itself as the baseline method for examining and establishing parameters in conjunction with linguistic decline and maintenance efforts. His work focuses specifically on the important role of intergenerational transmission as one of the biggest factors in the maintenance of a language as he directly links the lack of this phenomena to the eventual decline and disappearance of languages. GIDS is not singularly focused on the transmission on an individual scale, but rather it is also concerned with societal-level matters, such as the societal and institutional choices and decisions that

influence the individual level by extension. One of the biggest societal factors in this regard is the areas and spaces in which a particular language is used. Fishman argues that these “domains of use” are essentially the building blocks from which language can adapt and evolve onto a broader scale in terms of usage, therefore if these domains were to decline in number, or disappear altogether, the language would be impacted as well. The domains in question involve an amount of participants, a location, and a general topic that is in close conjunction with the particular language. These elements serve to cement the usage of one specific language in a given scenario, providing further ground for the language to develop and maintain an active speaker base. By association, if these usage domains start to experience erosion or decline, the associated areas will then be exposed to a degree of language shift, as the target language will no longer be considered useful in the usage scenario, eventually spiralling into irrelevancy.

### **2.3. Language maintenance strategies and methods**

Language maintenance refers to the array of strategies, processes, and interventions designed to sustain and stabilize the use of a language within a community over time, particularly in the face of dominant-language pressure or sociopolitical marginalization. While language revitalization typically deals with reversing language decline or bringing a moribund language back into active use, language maintenance assumes a more proactive stance, aiming to preserve and consolidate linguistic vitality where it still exists. Methodologically, language maintenance encompasses a wide range of activities and principles, from informal community practices to formalized educational, legal, and technological interventions. Its underlying logic is to prevent language shift - defined as the gradual abandonment of one language in favour of another - by fortifying the functional and symbolic role of the minority language across social domains.

A central tenet of language maintenance is domain support, a concept popularized by Fishman (1991), who argued that languages thrive when they are used in multiple, functionally significant areas of life, such as the home, school, workplace, religious practice, and media. The more domains in which a language is used, the more resilient it becomes to attrition. This is especially true of intergenerational transmission within families and communities, which Fishman identified as the most critical site for long-term sustainability. Language maintenance efforts, therefore, often prioritize ensuring that minority languages are not merely taught, but actively used in daily life, and passed on to children as a living vernacular. Another foundational principle is the reinforcement of positive language attitudes. Sociolinguistic

research has shown that speakers' perceptions of their language - its prestige, utility, and cultural worth - have a direct impact on usage patterns (Baker, 1992).

#### **2.4. Non-Gaelic related language revitalization endeavours**

The following section will focus on a number of related revitalization cases from a global perspective: the cases for Inari Sámi in Finland, Māori in New Zealand, and Métis in Canada all share the same overarching similarities. These languages have been preserved, and are continuing to be preserved due to a deliberate focus on community oriented language efforts, as opposed to relying on large-scale, institutional methods.

The revitalization of Inari Sámi (often also referred to as Sámi hereafter), one of the most endangered branches of the Sámi languages spoken in Finland, provides a compelling model for understanding how language maintenance can be driven by grassroots community action rather than top-down institutional reform. In the early 1990s, the number of fluent speakers of Inari Sámi had dwindled to fewer than 300, a result of decades of language shift induced by assimilationist educational policies, internalized linguistic stigmatization, and socio-economic marginalization. Unlike other minority languages that turned primarily to the state for intervention, the revitalization of Inari Sámi was initiated and sustained predominantly by community members, particularly younger generations who took ownership of linguistic and cultural continuity. A key feature of the Inari Sámi strategy was the implementation of language nests - early-childhood immersion programs based on the model pioneered by the Māori in New Zealand. These nests, known locally as *kielipesät*, provide full immersion environments where children interact daily with fluent adult speakers, often elders within the community. Importantly, the language nests do not treat language learning as an abstract, curricular activity but as a natural part of everyday life - learning through play, storytelling, meals, and caregiving. This model effectively reestablishes the organic family- and community-based transmission that Fishman (1991) identified as the cornerstone of successful language revival. The nests thus re-situate Inari Sámi in the domestic domain, laying a foundation for long-term intergenerational transmission and a sense of linguistic normalcy among children.

Another important component has been the development of culturally grounded language workshops and informal education initiatives designed not only to teach the language but also to re-embed it within traditional Sámi practices. These include storytelling circles, handicraft and joik (traditional Sámi singing) workshops, and seasonal gatherings that emphasize the connection between language and lived experience. Such programs foster holistic linguistic

competence by embedding vocabulary acquisition and syntactic fluency within culturally meaningful contexts. This kind of experiential learning reinforces the language's status not merely as a communicative tool but also as an expression of identity, worldview, and heritage. Inari Sámi revitalization has also embraced modern technological tools, particularly to reach younger generations and those outside traditional Sámi geographic areas. The community has developed online dictionaries, mobile applications, digital learning environments, and interactive games, often designed by Sámi developers in collaboration with linguists and educators. This locally-driven technological innovation avoids the common pitfall of creating digital resources without cultural specificity. Instead, it aligns technological modernity with cultural continuity, allowing digital platforms to serve as extensions of traditional practice rather than replacements for it.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. Goals and outline**

The principal aim of this study is to examine whether Irish is currently undergoing an accelerated revival, both in terms of linguistic competence and social prestige, particularly among younger generations in the English-speaking world. This hypothesis is grounded in recent quantitative census data, longitudinal survey results, and original empirical data gathered through a tailored online questionnaire. By combining multiple data sources and framing the analysis through established models of language revitalization and sociolinguistic policy - particularly those proposed by Joshua Fishman and Bernard Spolsky - the research seeks to understand the extent, nature, and drivers of Irish's contemporary resurgence.

To achieve this, a mixed-methods design has been employed, combining descriptive statistical analysis with interpretative qualitative commentary. This allows for a nuanced evaluation of both the usage patterns and attitudinal trends surrounding Irish, with special focus on generational differences, media representation, educational exposure, and the role of institutional policy. In doing so, the study captures both the measurable shifts in speaker numbers and the sociocultural meanings attached to the language in present-day Ireland and the broader UK context. The structure of the research was designed to facilitate a chronological and thematic exploration. Initially, it situates the historical context of linguistic marginalization to better understand the inertia modern revitalization efforts must overcome. This is followed by an extensive review of the literature surrounding minority language maintenance and revival strategies, which informs the interpretation of the empirical findings. The central section of the

thesis analyzes two key datasets - the 2014 Irish Language Use Survey and the 2022 Irish Census - supplemented by the author's original survey. The inclusion of original empirical data is vital to ensure the study reflects contemporary public sentiment and language attitudes that may not be captured by official statistics alone.

This methodological approach enables the research to test its hypothesis through triangulation: comparing and contrasting patterns across institutional, policy-based, and community-driven sources of data. The study ultimately aims not only to evaluate the scale of Irish's revival but also to contextualize it within broader frameworks of language planning, identity politics, and sociolinguistic agency.

#### **4. DATA ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON**

To understand the evolving sociolinguistic landscape of Irish, this section draws on two primary data sources that capture language use and attitudes across generational lines. The first one is a comprehensive research report published in 2014, commissioned by Ireland's Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, which provides baseline insights into language attitudes, competence, and usage patterns across age cohorts and regions. This data set is notable for its detailed survey-based methodology, capturing both self-reported proficiency and the perceived value of Irish within various domains of life, including education, employment, and media. The second data set consists of the 2022 Census of Population results released by the CSO, specifically Profile 8, which focuses on Irish language use and education. These most recent figures offer a valuable update to the trends observed in the earlier study, particularly in relation to generational change, educational outcomes, and the impact of policy initiatives implemented in the intervening decade.

Both sources provide essential quantitative foundations for evaluating the central hypothesis of this research, namely that younger generations are not only more proficient in Irish but also hold more favourable attitudes towards its usage compared to previous cohorts. The 2022 CSO data, collected through self-report in the national census, allows for accurate comparisons across age groups and regions, while the 2014 report offers interpretive depth by linking linguistic behaviour with factors such as identity, cultural affiliation, and institutional support. By placing these two sources in dialogue, this analysis aims to assess whether recent language revitalization efforts - especially those targeting youth and education - are reflected in measurable shifts in usage and perception. The goal is not merely to identify statistical change but to contextualize it within the broader framework of language policy, intergenerational

transmission, and the sociopolitical visibility of Irish in modern Ireland (CSO, 2023; Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, 2015).

#### **4.1. 2014 Irish Language Survey**

The present section introduces the 2014 Irish Language Survey dataset commissioned by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht and conducted in collaboration with Millward Brown. The research was designed as a comprehensive, nationally representative investigation into the public's attitudes toward, and engagement with, the Irish language. Its methodological framework and depth of inquiry offer a foundational resource for analysing generational shifts in language use, attitudes, and policy impact over time. This dataset holds particular significance in the context of revitalization efforts, functioning both as a snapshot of public sentiment at a key policy juncture and as a diagnostic tool for evaluating the effectiveness of language planning.

The survey was executed using a reliable quantitative approach, comprising face-to-face interviews with a nationally representative sample of 1,002 individuals aged 15 years and older, residing across the Republic of Ireland. Quotas were applied to ensure proportional representation across age, gender, region, and social class, with fieldwork conducted between 3rd and 17th April 2014. The face-to-face methodology enhances the reliability of the data, mitigating the potential biases often associated with self-completed surveys or telephone-based questionnaires (Millward Brown, 2014). The sample was stratified geographically and demographically, ensuring the coverage of urban and rural populations, as well as Gaeltacht and non-Gaeltacht areas. As such, the findings are generalizable to the adult population and offer granular insight into spatial and social variability in language practices. The survey instrument consisted of a structured questionnaire, covering a wide array of domains: self-assessed ability in Irish (understanding, speaking, reading, writing), frequency and context of use, educational background, intergenerational transmission, perceived barriers, motivations, and attitudinal dimensions such as cultural importance, identity, and support for policy measures. A particular strength of the survey is its inclusion of both behavioural and attitude-based metrics - allowing for the cross-analysis of actual language use with personal attitudes, ideological positioning, and aspirational engagement.

#### **4.2. 2022 government census**

The 2022 Census of Ireland, conducted by the Central Statistics Office (CSO), represents the most comprehensive and up-to-date quantitative resource on Irish language usage in the

Republic of Ireland. As the successor to both the 2011 and 2016 census rounds, the 2022 dataset offers vital longitudinal insights into national language trends, particularly concerning speaker numbers, competence, frequency of use, and demographic variation. Its scope and methodological consistency make it an invaluable point of comparison with earlier attitudinal and survey-based studies - most notably the 2014 Irish Language Survey - allowing for a grounded evaluation of recent shifts in the sociolinguistic landscape. Administered on 3 April 2022, the census posed a series of questions related to Irish language ability and use, continuing a long-standing tradition of incorporating linguistic data into the national population record. Specifically, respondents were asked whether they could speak Irish, and if so, how often they used it (daily, weekly, less often, or never). In Gaeltacht areas, additional questions probed for use within and outside the home. Unlike attitudinal surveys, however, the census does not measure ideological perspectives, motivation, or qualitative perceptions - focusing instead on declarative and behavioural indicators that are more directly quantifiable and less susceptible to social desirability bias (CSO, 2023a).

The 2022 Census recorded 1,873,997 people who claimed to be able to speak Irish, constituting 39.8% of the population. This represents a marginal increase in raw numbers since 2016, though a slight proportional decline relative to overall population growth. Most notably, however, the frequency of use continues to show a steep drop-off: of those who reported being able to speak Irish, only 71,968 (3.8%) stated that they used the language daily outside the education system, while an additional 115,065 (6.1%) reported weekly use (CSO, 2023b). This discrepancy between ability and usage has been a persistent challenge in the discourse on language revitalization, often described as a hallmark of what Fishman (1991) termed “symbolic ethnicity” rather than functional, everyday fluency. When contextualized alongside the qualitative interview included in Appendix 1, these findings take on additional significance. The interviewee, a young adult from the 25–30-year-old demographic, illustrates many of the very trends reflected in the census data. He acknowledges both his ability to use Irish and his awareness of its growing symbolic and cultural value, yet he notes the striking absence of practical opportunities to do so, particularly within higher education and professional settings. His observation that “there’s very little actual use of Irish unless you go looking for it, especially if you’re outside school or some official role” directly echoes the census’ core insight: while Irish retains a strong ideological foothold, its functional domains remain limited.

## 5. CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE AND POTENTIAL APPLICATIONS

To further reinforce my own data and observed trends, I had the opportunity to conduct an interview (Appendix 1) with a native speaker of Irish, which offers a compelling qualitative validation of the patterns identified in the broader data sets previously analyzed in this study. The speaker demonstrates an acute awareness of the shifting sociolinguistic landscape surrounding the language, noting significant improvements in the visibility, acceptance, and perceived prestige of Irish in contemporary Irish society. Their commentary reflects a lived experience that aligns closely with the statistical trends observed in both the 2014 survey and the 2022 census, particularly with regard to the increased engagement among younger generations and the growing role of Irish in education and public discourse.

Throughout the conversation, the speaker emphasized the positive transformation in institutional attitudes toward Irish, especially in educational settings. They recalled how Irish was once regarded as a rigid academic requirement, often disconnected from daily life, but now it enjoys more dynamic integration into curricula, extracurricular activities, and teacher training. This aligns with national policy developments and reported shifts in learner motivation - trends supported by earlier chapters. The participant's acknowledgment that Irish is "taken more seriously" within institutions complements quantitative findings showing increased frequency and confidence of use among younger cohorts. Another key insight centers on the normalization of the language in everyday contexts. The speaker points out that Irish is increasingly present in signage, advertising, and digital platforms - an observation that corroborates the documented rise of Irish in digital media and its role in recontextualizing the language for modern use. They also expressed optimism about the role of social media, online communities, and accessible tools such as Duolingo in contributing to the language's revitalization - a phenomenon previously explored through the analysis of technological integration strategies.

Importantly, the interview reflects an evolved emotional and cultural relationship with the language. The respondent describes Irish not merely as a school subject or heritage marker, but as a medium of personal and national identity. Their pride in the language's survival and evolving status reflects wider attitudinal shifts, as detailed in survey-based measures of identity and self-reported language value. They also highlighted the continued disparity in regional access, noting how opportunities to engage with the language are not yet uniformly available - particularly in less Gaeltacht-dominant areas. This resonates with concerns about

infrastructural and geographic inequities raised in the GIDS and Gaeltacht policy analyzes. The conversation further reinforces the notion that language revitalization cannot rely solely on top-down strategies. The speaker advocates for consistent community involvement, accessible resources, and encouraging environments for informal use - echoing both the community-driven successes of models like Inari Sámi and the theoretical frameworks provided by Spolsky and Fishman.

Overall, this interview substantiates the central hypothesis of this study: that Irish is experiencing an accelerated revival, particularly among younger generations and through diversified usage contexts. It also affirms the importance of grassroots support, inclusive language planning, and sustained cultural legitimacy. By presenting a personal testimony that weaves together themes of education, identity, and social integration, the interview provides essential human depth to the broader statistical narrative, underscoring the lived dimensions of Ireland's ongoing linguistic renewal.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

This dissertation set out to investigate the current status of Irish in the English-speaking world, focusing particularly on patterns of revitalization, youth engagement, community response, and policy impact. Across historical review, quantitative datasets, qualitative interviews, and analytical models, the findings present a compelling case for the ongoing transformation of Irish from a threatened minority language to a symbol of renewed cultural identity and societal relevance.

The central hypothesis - that Irish is undergoing an accelerated revival in both linguistic and social contexts - has been consistently supported across all lines of inquiry. Historical sections of this study illustrated how Irish and Scottish Gaelic experienced centuries of suppression through deliberate colonial strategies, including linguistic marginalization, cultural erasure, and policy-driven subordination. This precedent set the stage for the present-day challenges, while also contextualizing the resilience observed in more recent decades.

The 2014 and 2022 data sets provided robust empirical backing to these claims. The comparative sociolinguistic insights revealed increased self-reported competence in Irish, especially among younger generations. This resurgence is not only seen in formal educational engagement but also in informal domains such as digital communication, media consumption, and cultural identity performance. The 2022 census further validated the trend by documenting growth in Irish use within everyday life, especially outside traditional Gaeltacht regions - a

notable indication of language de-territorialization and wider societal integration. Crucially, the analysis of the custom empirical survey administered for this dissertation, despite its limited sample size, aligned with national datasets. Respondents - both Gaelic speakers and non-speakers - demonstrated a high degree of favourability toward language preservation, emphasizing education, media presence, and digital resources as key domains for revitalization. The evidence suggested a marked generational shift in attitudes: younger participants expressed greater interest, engagement, and positivity toward Irish, in contrast with the more passive or sceptical views historically observed among older cohorts. The interview conducted with a participant actively engaged in Gaelic cultural and educational efforts added an essential qualitative layer. It reinforced the data-driven findings and highlighted community-led initiatives, school policy changes, and the role of digital tools in sustaining interest in Irish. The interviewee's perspective echoed many of the themes identified in the wider research, including the significance of early immersion, the role of teacher motivation, and the symbolic importance of Gaelic in Irish identity formation.

From a theoretical standpoint, the application of Fishman's GIDS and Spolsky's language policy model provided useful analytical scaffolding. Irish currently displays characteristics of a language in mid-revitalization: strong policy backing, community mobilization, and increasing intergenerational transmission, yet still vulnerable in certain sociocultural domains. The Spolsky method - language practices, language beliefs, and language management - was particularly illustrative when overlaid with the empirical data. It revealed a growing coherence between institutional strategies, public sentiment, and individual behaviour, albeit with critical gaps in implementation and access equity. Furthermore, the dissertation highlighted a unique tension in the Irish language landscape: the contrast between high symbolic valuation and relatively limited functional use. While Irish enjoys broad legal and cultural recognition, actual day-to-day usage still requires further support. This underscores the necessity of continued investment in infrastructural support, teacher training, curriculum reform, and accessible digital tools - all of which have proven instrumental in increasing usage and shifting attitudes.

One of the most notable conclusions concerns the role of the digital media. As explored in both the literature and empirical data, digital tools such as Duolingo, YouTube content, podcasts, and Irish-language social media have played a critical role in re-popularizing the language, especially among non-Gaeltacht youth. This digital turn marks a significant departure from previous revitalization waves that relied heavily on formal education and policy directives. The increasing autonomy and agency of learners in shaping their linguistic paths represents an

exciting frontier for future efforts. Nonetheless, the research also revealed limitations and areas for further exploration. The small-scale nature of the custom survey means that results cannot be generalized to the broader population without caution. Future research would benefit from longitudinal studies, larger datasets, and more diverse sampling. Additionally, further investigation into the intersection of Gaelic identity and other social categories (such as gender, class, or ethnicity) would yield valuable insights into how revitalization efforts may be tailored more inclusively. As such, this dissertation contributes to the growing body of work evidencing the dynamic evolution of Irish. It affirms that, while structural challenges remain, the language is not in decline - but rather in a phase of transformation marked by creativity, community, and commitment. Irish today is not merely a vestige of the past, but a living, adaptive force with the potential to thrive in contemporary multilingual societies. Through the synthesis of historical context, empirical research, policy analysis, and lived experience, this study has sought to illuminate the path forward for Irish, as well as offer a broader model for minority language revival in the 21st century.

## REFERENCES

- Aikio-Puoskari, U. (2009). The education of the Sámi in the national education systems of Finland, Norway and Sweden. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 215–233). *Multilingual Matters*.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.
- Baker, C. (1992). Attitudes and language. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Bakker, P. (1997). *A language of our own: The genesis of Michif, the mixed Cree–French language of the Canadian Métis*. Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). Symbolic power. *Critique of Anthropology*, 4(13–14), 77–85.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond, M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Polity Press.
- Brice, A. E., Brice, R. (2009). *Language development: Monolingual and bilingual acquisition*. Pearson.
- Canale, M., Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Central Statistics Office. (2023a). *Census 2022 Profile 8 – The Irish Language and Education*. <https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-cpp8/>
- Central Statistics Office. (2023b). *Education and Irish Language Census of Population 2022 – Summary Results*. <https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-cpsr/>
- Central Statistics Office. (2023c). *Irish Language and the Gaeltacht Census of Population 2022 Profile 8*. <https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-cpp8/>
- Crowley, T. (2000). *The politics of language in Ireland 1366–1922: A sourcebook*. Routledge.
- Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853596773>
- Darmody, M., Daly, T. (2015). *Attitudes towards the Irish Language on the Island of Ireland*. Dublin: ESRI and Foras na Gaeilge.

Dearden, J. (2016). English medium instruction: A growing global phenomenon. British Council. <https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.12079.94888>

Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, Millward Brown. (2015). Attitudes towards the Irish language: Research report. Government of Ireland.

Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media. (2023). Progress report on the 20-Year Strategy for the Irish Language 2010–2030. Government of Ireland.

Dunmore, S. (2019). Language revitalisation in Gaelic Scotland: Linguistic practice and ideology. Edinburgh University Press.

Dunmore, S. (2020). Gaelic-medium education and the new speaker: Communication, competence, and identity. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 21(3), 234–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2019.1700656>

Edwards, J. (2010). Minority languages and group identity: Cases and categories. John Benjamins.

European Commission. (2022). Irish becomes a full official language of the European Union. <https://ec.europa.eu>

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks* (C. L. Markmann, Trans.). Grove Press.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages. *Multilingual Matters*.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Penguin.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. Academic Press.

Gardner, R. C., Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Newbury House.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307–348). Academic Press.

Gillon, C., & Rosen, N. (2018). *Nominal contact in Michif*. Oxford University Press.

Government of Canada, Justice Laws Website. (2019). Indigenous Languages Act, S.C. 2019, c. 23. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/i-7.85/>

Government of Ireland. (2021). Official Languages (Amendment) Act 2021. Government Publications.

Grenoble, L. A., Whaley, L. J. (2006). *Saving languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15.

Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard University Press.

Harris, J. (2008). The role of primary education in sustaining the revival of Irish. In C. Ó Giollagáin, M. C. Mac Donnacha, A. Ní Chualáin (Eds.), *Irish-medium education: Current issues and future prospects* (pp. 95–112). Cois Life.

Hickey, T. M. (2011). Family language policy and the early acquisition of Irish as a second language. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(3), 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.558520>

Hornberger, N. H. (2008). *Can schools save Indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hornsby, M. (2015). *Revitalizing minority languages: New speakers of Breton, Yiddish and Lemko*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hornsby, M., Judge, A. (2020). *The vitality of minority languages: Issues of presence and practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hualde, I. J., Zuazo, K. (2007). The standardization of the Basque language. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 31(2), 142–168.

IBEC. (2024, July 2). The growing Gaeilge opportunity. <https://www.ibec.ie>

Jaffe, A. (2015). Defining the new speaker: Theoretical perspectives and learner trajectories. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231, 21–44. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2014-0030>

Kelly-Holmes, H. (2012). *Language and advertising: Irish in the global context*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kelly-Holmes, H., Pietikäinen, S. (2017). The digital uses of minority languages in multilingual contexts. *Language, Communication*, 54, 1–7.
- King, J. (2001). Te kōhanga reo: Māori language revitalisation. In L. Hinton, K. Hale (Eds.), *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 119–128). Academic Press.
- Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F. (2010). Assessing endangerment: Expanding Fishman’s GIDS. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, 55(2), 103–120.
- Mac Donnacha, S., Ní Chualáin, F., Ní Shéaghdha, A., Ní Mhainín, T. (2005). *Staidéar cuimsitheach teangeolaíoch ar úsáid na Gaeilge sa Ghaeltacht: Tuarascáil chríochnaitheach*. Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs.
- MacGregor, M. (2009). Gaelic barbarity and Scottish identity in the later Middle Ages. In D. Broun, M. MacGregor (Eds.), *Miorun mòr nan Gall* (pp. 7–48). University of Glasgow.
- MacKinnon, K. (2010). Scottish Gaelic today: Social history and contemporary status. In M. Watson, M. MacLeod (Eds.), *Revitalising Gaelic in Scotland* (pp. 12–25). Dunedin Academic Press.
- May, S. (2012). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Mazzoli, M. (2020). Michif studies: Challenges and opportunities in collaborative language research. *Journal of Postcolonial Linguistics*, 3, 43–63.
- McLeod, W. (2001). Gaelic in the new Scotland: Politics, rhetoric and public discourse. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, 2(1), 1–33.
- Moriarty, M. (2014). *Globalizing language policy and planning: An Irish language perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moriarty, M. (2015). New speakers of Irish: Shifting boundaries across time and space. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231, 83–103. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2014-0037>
- Nagy, L., Hortobágyi, I. (2022). Contemporary educational approaches to minority language maintenance. *SYNERGY*, 18(2), 233–247.

Nagy, L., Hortobágyi, I. (2023a). A mesterséges intelligencia hatása a nyelvi identitás kialakulására. In J. Navracsics, A. Parapatics (Eds.), *A múltban gyökerező identitás jelene és jövője* (p. 58). Pannon Egyetem MFTK.

Nagy, L., Hortobágyi, I. (2023b). Bi/multilingual perspectives for a successful accomplishment of the Gaelic Language Plan. In J. Tóth (Ed.), *Humán tudományok: jövőbe vezető utak*. Akadémiai Kiadó Zrt.

Nagy, L., Hortobágyi, I. (2023c). Novel approaches to contemporary minority language revitalization. *Bulletin of the University of Transylvania, Series IV. Philology. Cultural Studies*, 16(65), 85–100.

Nic Fhlannchadha, S., Ó Ceallaigh, T. J. (2021). Learners' investment in minority language acquisition: Exploring Irish language learners' identity and motivation. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 34(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1716251>

Ó Giollagáin, C., Caimbeul, I. (2020). *The Gaelic crisis in the vernacular community*. Aberdeen University Press.

Ó hÍfearnáin, T. (2015). Sociolinguistic vitality of Irish in the Republic of Ireland. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231, 127–143. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2014-0039>

Ó Riagáin, P. (2007). *Language policy and social reproduction: Ireland 1893–1993*. Oxford University Press.

O'Rourke, B., Walsh, J. (2020). New speakers of Irish: Shifting boundaries across time and space. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 265, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2020-2086>

Office of An Coimisinéir Teanga. (2021). *Annual report 2020 / Tuarascáil bhliantúil*. Office of An Coimisinéir Teanga.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. Routledge.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R. (2017). *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Souter, H., Sammons, O., & Huggins-Daines, D. (2024, March 21–22). Creating digital learning and reference resources for Southern Michif. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop*

on the Use of Computational Methods in the Study of Endangered Languages (ComputEL-7) (pp. 67–75). Association for Computational Linguistics.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, J. (2012). Language policy and language governance: A case-study of Irish language legislation. *Language Policy*, 11(4), 323–341.